

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 31, 2007. A three month petition for extension of time is submitted herewith. The Examiner made a request for information under 37 C.F.R. §1.105. The Examiner also objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show a feature recited in the claims. The Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 8, 11-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as lacking support in the specification. The Examiner further rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 for being indefinite. Claim 5 was also objected to because of an informality. Claims 3, 5, 11 and 12 are currently amended. Reconsideration and reexamination in view of the arguments and amendments submitted herewith is respectfully requested.

Before addressing the rejections, it may be helpful to describe day tickets. Day tickets are tickets that are sold on the day of an event. Only a limited number of day ticket holders are allowed to enter. Usually, the day ticket holders that are allowed to enter are the first ones that “show up” or “check in” at the event site.

The claims of the present invention are directed to electronic day tickets. More specifically, a day ticket is saved on an electronic device. However, the day ticket may not be operable until a user enters a password (or a “second password” as per claims 5 and 13). The user may be provided the password (or second password) at the event site. More specifically, only a limited number of users of day tickets may be provided passwords at the event site. For example, only the first 500 day ticket users that check in at the event site may be provided passwords. Once a user has a password, he/she can enter the password at their portable terminal device. Once the password is entered the portable terminal device can display the ticket data which allows the user to enter the event site. Thus, embodiments of the present invention recited by the presently pending claims allow for the efficient issuance and administration of electronic day tickets.

The Examiner made a request for information under 37 C.F.R. §1.105. In response Applicants note that paper day tickets are known in the art. However, Applicants are not aware of any existing electronic day tickets that are displayed at portable electronic devices. Furthermore,

Applicants are certainly not aware of electronic day tickets which require the entry of a password obtained at the event site, as recited by the present claims.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show a feature recited in the claims. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the second password is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that the second password is shown as “PWD” in Fig. 2d.

The Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 8, 11-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as lacking support in the specification. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the phrase “executing the script” in the recitation “executing the script at the portable terminal device the script being configured to perform the following only if the software is loaded at the portable terminal device” was not supported. Applicants respectfully submit that this phrase is supported by the Specification. First a script is disclosed by the Specification. See, for example:

The terminal 102 or 103 displays the ticket data supplied from the ticket issue server 101 in a predetermined manner. For example, the ticket data basically includes script information for defining a display mode, and is displayed by the script such as HTML. Checking the displayed information, the event management authenticates the user of the terminal, who owns the ticket for the event. (page 8, lines 19-25)

Furthermore, at page 15, the Specification discloses that “[t]he display screen may be of a format compliant with particular software to disable the displaying of screens unless such software is installed and unless the user is registered ...”

The Examiner also raised questions as to what the registrant database is and whether this is new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the registrant database is disclosed by the Specification. See, for example, Fig. 1, element 111, page 8, lines 2-5. As disclosed by the Specification, a registrant database is a database that stores data about the users that are registered with the ticket issue server and is able to determine whether access requests are placed by registered users.

Claim 5 was objected to because of an informality. Applicants hereby amend claim 5 to recite a “first password” as suggested by the Examiner.

Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 for being indefinite. The Examiner states that the claim is inconsistent with other claims because other claims recite that certain actions are performed by a “ticket issue server” and claim 5 recites that these actions are performed by a reception server. Applicants submit that claim 5 merely recites a different embodiment from said other claims.

As disclosed by the Specification (see, e.g., page 15, line 25 through page 16, line 2) the ticket issue server may perform two functions – reserve a ticket and send the ticket data to a user’s portable device. However, in an alternative embodiment, the reservation can be performed by a different server referred to in the Specification as a reservation acceptance server, while the issuance of the ticket is performed by the ticket issue server. Claims 3 and 4 are supported by embodiments in which both of these actions are performed by a single ticket issue server. Claim 5 is supported by an embodiment in which these actions are performed by two servers.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (213) 892-5970.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 393032028500. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By
Hristo Vachovsky

Registration No.: 55,694
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street
Los Angeles, California 90013-1024
(213) 892-5200